

**AMENDMENTS to the DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

## **REMARKS**

### **Reconsideration by the Examiner**

We appreciate the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 regarding the term "modified fields".

### **New Claims**

In the present amendment, we have added claims to system and computer-readable memory embodiments according to our invention which correspond to the method claims previously examined.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph and second paragraph appear to center on the term "previous cleaning operation", where "previous" is indefinite and is not described in the disclosure per the Examiner's explanation.

By "previous cleaning operation", we mean "after" a cleaning operation has been performed. This interpretation is supported by extrinsic definitions of "previous" and "after" (source: Oxford English Dictionary, retrieved on 01/06/2009 from <http://dictionary.oed.com>, our emphasis added):

#### **after**

##### *A. adverb*

...

2. Of time: **Subsequently**, at a later time; afterwards. . . .

##### *B. prep.*

...

II. Of time.

6. **Following in the succession of time**; in succession to. Freq. in expressions of the type day after day, man after man.

7. **Subsequent to a space of time**; after the interval of, at the close of. In mod. usage after three months varies with three months after, the former emphasizing the interval.

8. a. **Subsequent to or later than a point of time**. (Not necessarily in immediate sequence.) after hours: after the regular hours of work; also, after the regular hours of opening (of a public house, etc.). Also (both senses) attrib. and in form after-hour.

...

9. Of temporal and logical sequence: . . .

**previous**A. *adjective*

1. a. attrib. **Coming or going before (in time or order); foregoing, preceding,** antecedent.

...

We respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to our pre-grant published disclosure at Figure 6 #61 ("While or after cleaning data"), paragraph 0029 ("... after cleaning has been performed ..."), paragraph 0032 ("... after a data mining run."), paragraph 0089 ("... after cleaning of the entire raw data set ...").

"After" and "before" are antonyms, of course, so according to our diagrams and descriptions, our method is perform during or after a data cleaning process, thus the data cleaning process is "previous" to our process.

The present amendment removes the term "previous" from the claims in view of our broader disclosure "during or after". We respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

With respect to the maintained rejections over Burdick in view of our background section of our disclosure, we appreciate the Examiner's response to our arguments and further explanation. However, we respectfully disagree with each of the Examiner's conclusions and interpretations of the Burdick disclosure regarding each of our claims, and we do not believe a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been established. We respectfully maintain all arguments previous submitted to the Examiner regarding these rejections, and regarding the Burdick reference.

**Request for Explicit Resolution of Ordinary Skill Level.** We respectfully repeat our request for the Examiner to explicitly resolve for the written record the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of our invention, whereas such a skill level is necessary to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ("*... To determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the way a patent claims, it will often be necessary to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; to the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and to the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art. **To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit.** ...*" *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., et al.*, (U.S. Supreme Court, April 30, 2007)). We respectfully suggest that the current rationale for the rejections does not explicitly determine what "background knowledge" a person of ordinary skill in the art had beyond the cited references. It is unestablished whether a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of our invention would have been *able* to make the combinations and modifications we have disclosed and claimed because it is unestablished what skill, experience, and education level such a person would have

possessed at that time. For example, a person may readily access information regarding surgical procedures on the internet, but having access to the information does not mean that a person can properly or successfully use the information. Such successful use of such information would require a medical degree, for example. In the present analysis of our invention, only publicly available information has been cited, but no skill, experience or education level has been established. Therefore, we submit that it is undetermined if an ordinarily skilled person could have synthesized our claimed solution from the public information cited by the Examiner.

Nature of Amendment. We have amended the recitations of Claim 3 into Claim 1 in order to promote examination of the present patent application to allowance of at least a portion of the allowable subject matter which we believe is patentable. We are not conceding that Claim 1 in its unamended state is not patentable. We respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims directed to the scope and subject matter of unamended Claim 1 in one or more related patent applications.

Burdick's Figure 1 is Misinterpreted as a Table of Data Records. With respect to the rejection of the steps, elements and limitations previously set forth in Claim 3, now set forth in Claim 1, we respectfully disagree that Burdick's Figure 1 represents a set of data records. Figure 1 is a "schematic representation" illustration of the "different factors" which may result in dirty data, per Burdick's paragraphs 0003 and 0010. We respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not confuse such a "schematic representation of factors of causes of dirty data" with an actual table of data records.

Burdick is Silent Regarding Appending Attributes. With respect to "appending" anything to Figure 1, Burdick's only use of the term "append" in their disclosure appears at paragraph 0073 relative to "appended claims", and thus, Burdick is silent regarding "appending attribute flags to a data record" as we have claimed. Burdick's "fusing" of records in paragraph 0034 is merging of two records, which is not the same as appending generated attribute flags to an existing record. Burdick's paragraph 0038 discloses well known structures of normal data records (e.g. fields, data type definitions), but is silent regarding appending our attributes as we have claimed to cleaned data records.

Burdick is Silent Regarding Prepending Attributes. With respect to "prepending" anything to Figure 1, we mean adding our attribute flags to be beginning of a data record (source: Oxford English Dictionary, retrieved on 01/06/2009 from <http://www.dictionary.com>):

**prepend**

verb, Chiefly *Computing*.

*trans.* To add at the beginning, to prefix, prepose; esp. to add or append (a character, string, file, etc.) at the front of an existing string, file, etc.

Burdick's disclosure is silent regarding "prepending".

Burdick is Silent Regarding Distributing or Tabularizing Attributes. Regarding distributing a set of cleaning attributes to each cleaned data record or generating a cleaning attribute table, Burdick is silent regarding the term "distribute", "attribute table", or "table of attributes". These terms do not appear in Burdick's disclosure.

Request for Extrinsic or Sworn Support for Synonyms to Missing Terminology. If the Examiner disagrees and believes that synonyms for these terms appear in the Burdick disclosure, we respectfully request the Examiner to provide extrinsic evidence of such synonymous definitions. If these synonyms are of the personal knowledge of the Examiner, we respectfully ask the Examiner to please so state according to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2) via an affidavit.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter. We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

*/ Robert Frantz /*

Robert H. Frantz  
U.S. Patent Agent, Reg. N<sup>o</sup> 42,553  
Tel: (405) 812-5613  
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC